arXiv:1605.07527v1 [math.LO] 24 May 2016

FERMAT-LIKE EQUATIONS THAT ARE NOT PARTITION REGULAR

MAURO DI NASSO AND MARIA RIGGIO

Abstract. By means of elementary conditions on coefficients, we isolate a large class of Fermat-like Diophantine equations that are not partition regular, the simplest examples being $x^n+y^m=z^k$ with $k\notin\{n,m\}$.

1. Introduction

By a *Fermat-like equation* we mean a Diophantine equation that generalizes equations $x^n+y^n=z^n$ to the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i x_i^n + \sum_{j=1}^{t} b_j y_j^m \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{u} c_k z_k^r.$$

This is a particularly relevant class of equations; especially in their simplest cases $ax^n+by^m=cz^r$, they have been extensively studied in number theory, leading to several important open questions that seem still far to be solved. (See, *e.g.*, [1] and references therein.) Here we study those equations from the point of view of *Ramsey theory*. The central notion is that of *partition regularity*, that can be seen as the existence of "diffuse" solutions, in the sense that no matter how one splits the natural numbers into finitely many pieces, solutions are found in one of the pieces.

Definition. An equation $f(x_1,\dots,x_n)=0$ is *partition regular* on $\mathbb{N}$ (PR for short) if for every finite coloring (partition) $\mathbb{N}=C_1\cup\ldots\cup C_r$ there exist *monochromatic* $a_1,\dots,a_n\in C_i$ that are a solution $f(a_1,\dots,a_n)=0$.

The problem of partition regularity of the linear diophantine equations $c_1x_1+\ldots+c_nx_n=0$ was completely solved by R. Rado [14] in 1933. Precisely, he characterized the linear equations that are PR by means of a really simple condition on the coefficients, namely $\sum_{i\in I}c_i=0$ for some nonempty $I\subseteq\{1,\dots,n\}$. While Rado's Theorem has been widely extended in various directions so as to also include infinite systems of linear equations (see, *e.g.*, the recent papers [9, 5, 11] and references therein), very little is known about nonlinear equations. On this last topic, relevant progresses have been recently made by P. Csikvári, K. Gyarmati and A. Sárközy. In the paper [4] appeared in 2012, they proved the PR of $xy=z^2$ and of $xy+xz=yz$; and

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03H05; 03E05, 05D10, 11D04.

Key words and phrases. Nonstandard analysis, Ramsey theory, Diophantine equations.

the *non*-PR of $x+y=z^2$. Moreover, they proved the PR of Fermat's equations $x^n+y^n=z^n$ (with $xyz\neq 0$) in all sufficiently large finite fields $\mathbb{F}_p$. An important result on the interplay between additive and multiplicative structure on $\mathbb{N}$ was proved by N. Hindman [10] in 2011, who showed the PR of equations $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = \prod_{i=1}^{n} y_i$. To our knowledge, the last contributions in this area were given by L. Luperi Baglini by using nonstandard analysis. In the paper [13] of 2014, he succeeded in generalizing Hindman's result in several directions, by proving the PR of many nonlinear equations (a simple example is $x_1y_1+x_2y_1y_2-x_3=0$).

At the foot of the paper [4], it is left as an open problem the PR of all Fermat-like equations $x^n+y^m=z^k$ on sufficiently large finite fields $\mathbb{F}_p$. In this paper we focus on the related problem of partition regularity on $\mathbb{N}$ of a large class of generalized Fermat-like equations, and we isolate necessary conditions for their PR. In particular, as the simplest cases, we show that equations $x^n+y^m=z^k$ where $k\notin\{n,m\}$ are not PR on $\mathbb{N}$.

Our proofs make use of the *hypernatural numbers* ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ of *nonstandard analysis*. Essentially, the nonstandard framework provides a simplified formalism to the use of ultrafilters, making it closer to the familiar intuition of natural numbers. The results presented in this paper originated from the Master thesis [15].

Let us fix our notation. With $\mathbb{N}$ we denote the set of positive integers. For $n\in\mathbb{N}$, we write $[n]$ for $\{1,\dots,n\}$. We use p to denote a prime number, and write $p\,|\,a$ to mean $a\equiv 0 \mod p$, and $p\nmid a$ to mean $a\not\equiv 0 \mod p$. (So, trivially, $p\,|\,0$.)

2. The results

In this section we state our main theorems and show a few consequences. Proofs are found in the next section.

Theorem 2.1. *Consider the diophantine equation*

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{h}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell} a_{\ell,i}\,x_{\ell,i}^{n_\ell}\right) \;=\; 0. \tag{2.1}$$

where $n_1<\ldots<n_h$. Suppose there exists a prime p such that

1. $\sum_{i\in\Gamma_\ell} a_{\ell,i}\not\equiv 0 \mod p$ *for every ℓ and for every nonempty $\Gamma_\ell\subseteq[s_\ell]$;*
2. $\sum_{\ell=1}^{h}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} a_{\ell,i}\right)\rho^{n_\ell}\not\equiv 0 \mod p$ *for every $\rho\not\equiv 0 \mod p$.*

Then (2.1) is not partition regular on $\mathbb{N}$, except possibly for constant solutions.

Example 2.2. *The equation $x^3-y^2+2z=0$ is not PR. Indeed, the theorem above applies by taking $p=3$.*

The previous example easily generalizes as follows. Let $P(\rho)=\sum_{j=0}^{h} b_j\rho^{n_j}$ be a polynomial where $0=n_0<n_1<\ldots<n_h$. If there is a prime p that

does not divide any of the coefficients b_j, and such that P has no solutions modulo p, then the equation $\sum_{j=0}^{h} b_j x_j^{n_j+k} = 0$ is not PR for every $k \geq 1$.

Example 2.3. *The equation* $\sum_{\ell=1}^{h} a_i z^n = z^{n+3}$ *is not PR whenever all coefficients* $|a_i| < 7$ *and* $\sum_{\ell=1}^{h} a_i \not\equiv \pm 1 \mod 7$. *Indeed, in this case the theorem above applies with* $p = 7$ *because* $(\sum_{\ell=1}^{h} a_i)\rho^n \equiv \rho^{n+3} \mod 7$ *has only the trivial solution* $\rho \equiv 0$.

Theorem 2.4. *Consider the diophantine equation*

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell} a_{\ell,i}\, x_{\ell,i}^{n_\ell} \right) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

where $n_1 < \ldots < n_h$, *and where*

(1) $\sum_{i\in\Gamma_\ell} a_{\ell,i} \neq 0$ *for every* ℓ *and for every nonempty* $\Gamma_\ell \subseteq [s_\ell]$.

Suppose there exists a prime number p *that satisfies the following:*

(2) *There exists* ℓ' *such that* $p \nmid \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\ell'}} a_{\ell',i}$ *and* $p \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} a_{\ell,i}$ *for* $\ell \neq \ell'$;

(3) $p^{n_{\ell'}-n_\ell} \nmid \sum_{i\in\Gamma_\ell} a_{\ell,i}$ *for every* $\ell' > \ell$ *and for every nonempty* $\Gamma_\ell \subseteq [s_\ell]$.

Then (2.2) is not partition regular on $\mathbb{N}$, *except possibly for constant solutions.*

Corollary 2.5. *Consider the diophantine equation*

$$ax^n + by^n = cz^m\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Assume that one of the following conditions holds:

(i) $n < m$ *and there exists a prime* p *such that* $p \mid c$ *but* $p \nmid a + b$;

(ii) $n > m$ *and there exists a prime* p *such that* $p \mid a + b$ *but* $p \nmid c$;

(iii) $n = m$ *and* $a + b \neq 0$ *and* $a, b, a + b \neq c$.

Then (2.3) is not partition regular on $\mathbb{N}$, *except possibly for constant solutions.*

Proof. Notice that condition (3) in the previous theorem is trivially satisfied when $p \mid \sum_{i=1}^{s_h} a_{h,i}$ and $p \nmid \sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell} a_{\ell,i}$ for $\ell < h$. Then (i) and (ii) directly follow. As for (iii), notice that if equation (2.3) was partition regular when $n = m$, then also $ax + by = cz$ would be partition regular. Indeed, given a finite coloring $\mathbb{N} = C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_r$, one picks a monochromatic solution a, b, c of (2.3) with respect to the coloring $\mathbb{N} = C_1' \cup \ldots \cup C_r'$ where $C_j' = \{n \mid n^2 \in C_j\}$, and obtain the monochromatic solution a^2, b^2, c^2. But then, by Rado's Theorem on linear equations, we would have $a + b = 0$ or $a = c$ or $b = c$ or $a + b = c$. □

Example 2.6. *Equations* $x + y = cz^k$ *where* $k > 1$ *and* $c > 1$ *is odd are not PR. Indeed, the corollary above applies by taking any odd prime* $p \mid c$.

Example 2.7. *Equations $x^n + y^n = cz$ where $n > 1$ and $c > 1$ is odd are not PR. Indeed, the corollary above applies by taking the prime $p = 2$.*

Theorem 2.8. *Consider the diophantine equation*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i x_i^n \;=\; y^{n+1}. \tag{2.4}$$

Suppose that for every nonempty $\Gamma \subseteq [s]$ one has

(1) $\sum_{i\in\Gamma} a_i \neq 0$;
(2) $\sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i + n \sum_{i\notin\Gamma} a_i \neq 0$.

Then (2.4) is not partition regular on $\mathbb{N}$, except possibly for constant solutions.

Corollary 2.9. *If $a + b \neq 0$, $(n + 1)a + b \neq 0$ and $a + (n + 1)b \neq 0$, then $ax^n + by^n = z^{n+1}$ is not partition regular on $\mathbb{N}$.*

Example 2.10. *The equation $x + y = z^2$ is not PR.*[1]

An interesting case that is not covered by the previous results is the following.

Theorem 2.11. *Consider the diophantine equation*

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{h} a_\ell x^{n_\ell} \;=\; 0 \tag{2.5}$$

where where $n_1 < \ldots < n_\ell$. If all coefficients a_ℓ are odd, and h is odd, then (2.5) is not partition regular on $\mathbb{N}$.

Example. *The equations $ax + by^2 = cz^3$ where a, b, c are odd are not PR.*

Corollary 2.12. *Equations $x^n + y^m = z^k$ where $k \notin \{n, m\}$ are not partition regular on $\mathbb{N}$, except for the constant solution $x = y = z = 2$ of equations $x^n + y^n = z^{n+1}$.*

Proof. If $x = y = z = a$ is a constant solution, *i.e.* if $a^n + a^m = a^k$, then it is easily verified that it must be $n = m$, $a = 2$ and $k = n + 1$.

Assume first $n = m$, and let us consider the prime $p = 2$. If $k < n$, then the thesis is given by (ii) of Corollary 2.5. If $k > n + 1$ then hypotheses of Theorem 2.4 are satisfied, and also in this case we get the thesis. When $k = n + 1$, the thesis follows from Corollary 2.9. Finally, if n, m, k are mutually distinct, the thesis is given by the previous Theorem 2.11. □

[1] This fact was first proved by P. Csikvári, K. Gyarmati and A. Sárközy in [4].

3. The proofs

For our proofs we will use the methods of *nonstandard analysis*. We assume the reader to be familiar with its fundamental notions, most notably the *transfer principle* and the κ-*saturation* property. (Excellent references are the textbook [8] and the updated recent monography [12].) In addition to the usual basic nonstandard tools, we will consider the following equivalence relation on the set ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ of *hypernatural numbers*. (See [7]; see also [6] where u-equivalent numbers are called *indiscernible*.)

Definition. Two numbers $\xi, \eta \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ are *u-equivalent*, and we write $\xi \simeq_u \eta$, if $\xi \in {}^*A \Leftrightarrow \eta \in {}^*A$ for every $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.

Every hypernatural number $\alpha \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ generates an ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$, namely $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha \in {}^*A\}$. It is readily seen that $\xi \simeq_u \eta$ if and only if they generate the same ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}_\xi = \mathcal{U}_\eta$. We will assume the nonstandard model to be sufficiently saturated ($\mathfrak{c}^+$-saturation suffices), so that every ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ on $\mathbb{N}$ is generated by some element $\alpha \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$.

It is well-known that partition regularity of equations can be characterized in terms of ultrafilters. Precisely, an equation $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$ is *partition regular* on $\mathbb{N}$ if and only if there exists an ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ on $\mathbb{N}$ with the property that every $A \in \mathcal{U}$ contains elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ that are a solution $f(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 0$. In the nonstandard setting, such a property can be equivalently reformulated as follows.

Theorem. *An equation $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$ is PR on $\mathbb{N}$ if and only if there exist u-equivalent numbers $\xi_1 \simeq_u \ldots \simeq_u \xi_n$ such that $f(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n) = 0$.*

We will use the following three basic properties of u-equivalence, whose proofs can be found in §2 of [7].

(a) If $\alpha \simeq_u n \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\alpha = n$;

(b) If $\alpha \simeq_u \beta$ then ${}^*f(\alpha) \simeq_u {}^*f(\beta)$ for every $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$;

(c) If $\alpha \simeq_u \beta$ and $\alpha < \beta$ then $\beta - \alpha$ is infinite;

(d) For every $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, if ${}^*f(\alpha) \simeq_u \alpha$ then ${}^*f(\alpha) = \alpha$.

We remark that property (d) is the nonstandard counterpart of the basic (but nontrivial) property of ultrafilters: "$f(\mathcal{U}) = \mathcal{U} \Rightarrow \{n \mid f(n) = n\} \in \mathcal{U}$."

We are now ready to prove the results stated in the previous section.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. By contradiction, assume there exist u-equivalent hypernatural numbers $\xi_{\ell,i}$ such that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell} a_{\ell,i}\, \xi_{\ell,i}^{n_\ell} \right) \;=\; 0. \tag{3.1}$$

The numbers ξ_i are not all equal to each other, otherwise by *transfer* we would have a constant solution to our equation. Notice also that all numbers $\xi_{\ell,i}$ are infinite as otherwise, by the properties of u-equivalence,

they would all be equal to each other and finite, and they would form a constant solution. Fix a sufficiently large prime number p, and write

$$\xi_{\ell,i} \;=\; p^{\nu_{\ell,i}}\zeta_{\ell,i}+\rho$$

where the $\zeta_{\ell,i}$ are not divisible by p. Numbers $\zeta_{\ell,i}$ are u-equivalent to each other, and exponents $\nu_{\ell,i}$ are u-equivalent to each other. Notice that all $\nu_{\ell,i}>0$, since all $\xi_{\ell,i}$ are infinite. By u-equivalence, all $\zeta_{\ell,i}\equiv r \mod p$ for a suitable $1\leq r\leq p-1$. Now let $\nu_\ell=\min\{\nu_{\ell,i}\mid i\in[s_\ell]\}$. Notice that $n_\ell\nu_\ell\neq n_{\ell'}\nu_{\ell'}$ for every $\ell\neq\ell'$, as otherwise $n_\ell\nu_\ell=n_{\ell'}\nu_{\ell'}\underset{u}{\sim}n_{\ell'}\nu_\ell\Rightarrow n_\ell\nu_\ell=n_{\ell'}\nu_\ell\Rightarrow\nu_\ell=0$, a contradiction. In consequence, there exists a unique ℓ^* such that $n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*}=\min\{n_\ell\nu_\ell\mid\ell\in[h]\}$. Finally, let $\Gamma_{\ell^*}=\{i\in[s_{\ell^*}]\mid\nu_{\ell^*,i}=\nu_{\ell^*}\}$.

By reducing (3.1) modulo p, we obtain $\sum_{\ell=1}^{h}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell}a_{\ell,i}\right)\rho^{n_\ell}\equiv 0 \mod p$, and hence $\rho=0$, by hypothesis (2). By factoring out $p^{n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*}}$ in equality (2.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0 \;=\; &\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}\zeta_{\ell^*,i}^{n_{\ell^*}}+\sum_{i\notin\Gamma_{\ell^*}}p^{n_{\ell^*}(\nu_{\ell^*,i}-\nu^*)}a_{\ell^*,i}\zeta_{\ell^*,i}^{n_{\ell^*}}+\\ &+\sum_{\ell\neq\ell^*}\sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell}p^{n_\ell\nu_{\ell,i}-n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell,i}\zeta_{\ell,i}^{n_\ell}\;\equiv\;\left(\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}\right)r^n \mod p.\end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, because $\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}\not\equiv 0 \mod p$ by hypotheses (1), and because $r\not\equiv 0 \mod p$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We argue by contradiction. Let p be a prime number as given by the hypothesis. By adopting the same notation, the arguments used in the first part of the proof of Theorem 2.1 show that $\sum_{\ell=1}^{h}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell}a_{\ell,i}\right)\rho^{n_\ell}\equiv 0 \mod p$, and so hypothesis (2) guarantees that $\rho=0$. By factoring out p^τ in equality (3.1), we obtain

$$\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}\zeta_{\ell^*,i}^{n_{\ell^*}}+\sum_{i\notin\Gamma_{\ell^*}}p^{n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*,i}-\tau}a_{\ell^*,i}\zeta_{\ell,i}^{n_{\ell^*}}+\sum_{\ell\neq\ell^*}\sum_{i=1}^{s_\ell}p^{n_\ell\nu_{\ell,i}-\tau}a_{\ell,i}\zeta_{\ell,i}^{n_\ell}\;=\;0. \tag{3.2}$$

The number $\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}\neq 0$ by hypothesis (1), and so we can factor $\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}=p^{d^*}N$ where N is not divisible by p. (It may be $d^*=0$.) By u-equivalence, there exists $1\leq R\leq p^{d^*+1}-1$ such that all $\zeta_{\ell,i}\equiv R \mod p^{d^*+1}$. Recall that $\zeta_{\ell,i}\equiv r\neq 0 \mod p$; so $NR^{n_{\ell^*}}\not\equiv 0 \mod p$ and

$$\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}\zeta_{\ell^*,i}^{n_{\ell^*}}\;\equiv\;\left(\sum_{i\in\Gamma_{\ell^*}}a_{\ell^*,i}\right)R^{n_{\ell^*}}\;\equiv\;p^{d^*}NR^{n_{\ell^*}}\;\not\equiv 0 \mod p^{d^*+1}. \tag{3.3}$$

Notice that for every $i\notin\Gamma_\ell^*$, the exponent $n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*,i}-\tau=n_{\ell^*}(\nu_{\ell^*,i}-\nu_{\ell^*})$ is infinite, since $\nu_{\ell^*,i}\underset{u}{\sim}\nu_{\ell^*}$ and $\nu_{\ell^*,i}>\nu_{\ell^*}$. So, the second term in (3.1) is a multiple of p^{d^*+1}. If $n_\ell\nu_{\ell,i}-\tau$ is infinite for every $\ell\neq\ell^*$ and for every $i=1,\ldots,n_\ell$, then also the third term in (3.2) is a multiple of p^{d+1}. In

this case, the quantity on the left side of equation (3.2) is congruent to $p^{d^*}NR^{n_{\ell^*}} \not\equiv 0 \mod p^{d^*+1}$, and so it cannot be equal to 0, a contradiction.

Finally, let us suppose that there exist $\ell \neq \ell^*$ and i such that $n_\ell \nu_{\ell,i} - \tau = n_\ell \nu_{\ell,i} - n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*} = e$ is finite. By the properties of u-equivalence, $n_\ell \nu_{\ell,i} = n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*} + e \underset{u}{\sim} n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell,i} + e \Rightarrow n_\ell \nu_{\ell,i} = n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell,i} + e \Leftrightarrow (n_\ell - n_{\ell^*})\nu_{\ell,i} = e$. Then $\nu_{\ell,i}$ is finite, and hence $\nu_{\ell',i'} = \nu_{\ell,i} = \nu$ for every $\ell' = 1, \ldots, h$ and for every $i' = 1, \ldots, s_{\ell'}$. Notice also that it must be $\ell > \ell^*$ and so, by hypothesis (3), $n_\ell \nu_{\ell,i} - \tau = (n_\ell - n_{\ell^*})\nu \geq d^* + 1$. Also in this case, and similarly as above, we reach a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 2.8. We proceed similarly as in the proof of the previous theorem. Assume by contradiction that there exist u-equivalent hypernatural numbers ξ_i and η that are not all equal to each other and such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i \xi_i^n \;=\; \eta^{n+1}. \tag{3.4}$$

All numbers ξ_i, η are infinite as otherwise, by the properties of u-equivalence, they would form a constant solution. Fix a "sufficiently large" prime p, and write

$$\xi_i = p^{\nu_i}\zeta_i + \rho\,; \quad \eta = p^\mu \theta + \rho$$

where $0 \leq \rho \leq p-1$, and where the ζ_i and θ are not divisible by p. Notice that all exponents $\nu_i, \mu > 0$, since all ξ_i and η are infinite. By u-equivalence, $\zeta_i, \theta \equiv r \mod p$ for a suitable $1 \leq r \leq p-1$. Let $\nu = \min\{\nu_i \mid i \in [s]\}$, and set $\Gamma = \{i \in [s] \mid \nu_i = \nu\}$. By reducing (3.4) modulo p, we obtain $(\sum_{i=1}^s a_i)\rho^n \equiv \rho^{n+1} \mod p$. It follows that either $\rho = 0$ or $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i$.

If $\rho = 0$ then equation (3.4) becomes:

$$p^{n\nu}\left(\sum_{i\in\Gamma} a_i\zeta_i^n + \sum_{i\notin\Gamma} p^{n(\nu_i-\nu)}a_i\zeta_i^n\right) \;=\; p^{(n+1)\mu}\theta^{n+1}$$

where both $\sum_{i\in\Gamma} a_i\zeta_i^n$ and θ^{n+1} are not divisible by p. But then we have $n\nu = (n+1)\mu \underset{u}{\sim} (n+1)\nu \Rightarrow n\nu = (n+1)\nu \Rightarrow \nu = 0$, a contradiction.

Now assume $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i$. From equation (3.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i(p^{\nu_i}\zeta_i + \rho)^n \;&=\; \left(\sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i\right)\rho^n + p^\nu n\,\rho^{n-1}\left(\sum_{s\in\Gamma} a_i\zeta_i\right) + A \;= \\ &=\; (p^\mu\theta + \rho)^{n+1} \;=\; \rho^{n+1} + p^\mu(n+1)\rho^n\theta + B\end{aligned}$$

where $p^\nu \,|\, A$ and $p^\mu \,|\, B$. Notice that $(\sum_{i=1}^s a_i)\rho^n = \rho^{n+1}$, and notice also that $(n+1)\rho^n\theta \equiv (n+1)\rho^n r \not\equiv 0 \mod p$. Moreover, by hypothesis (1),

$$n\rho^{n-1}\left(\sum_{s\in\Gamma} a_i\zeta_i\right) \;\equiv\; n\rho^{n-1}r\left(\sum_{s\in\Gamma} a_i\right) \;\not\equiv\; 0 \mod p.$$

So, it must be $\nu = \mu$ and $n\rho^{n-1}r(\sum_{s\in\Gamma} a_i) \equiv (n+1)\rho^n r$. By factoring out $\rho^{n-1}r$, we obtain $n(\sum_{s\in\Gamma} a_i) \equiv (n+1)\rho = (n+1)\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mod p$, and so $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + n\sum_{i\notin\Gamma} a_i \equiv 0 \mod p$. Since we picked a large enough p, this contradicts hypothesis (2). □

Proof of Theorem 2.11. By contradiction, assume we can pick u-equivalent numbers ξ_ℓ such that $\sum_{\ell=1}^h a_\ell \xi^{n_\ell} = 0$. By u-equivalence, the numbers ξ_ℓ have the same parity and so they must be even, since the coefficients a_ℓ and the number h of terms are odd. Let $\xi_\ell = 2^{\nu_\ell}\zeta_\ell$ where exponents $\nu_\ell > 0$ are u-equivalent, and where ξ_ℓ are u-equivalent and odd. Notice that numbers $n_\ell\nu_\ell$ are mutually distinct. Indeed, *e.g.*, suppose $n_\ell\nu_\ell = n_{\ell'}\nu_{\ell'}$ for some $\ell \neq \ell'$; then by the properties of u-equivalence, one would have $n_\ell\nu_\ell = n_{\ell'}\nu_{\ell'} \underset{u}{\sim} n_{\ell'}\nu_\ell \Rightarrow n_\ell\nu_\ell = n_{\ell'}\nu_\ell$, and hence $\nu_\ell = 0$, a contradiction. Let $n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*} = \min\{n_\ell\nu_\ell \mid \ell \in [h]\}$. By factoring out $p^{n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*}}$ in $\sum_{\ell=1}^h a_\ell\xi^{n_\ell} = 0$, we obtain the contradiction

$$0 \;=\; a_{\ell^*}\xi_{\ell^*}^{n_{\ell^*}} + \sum_{\ell\neq\ell^*} a_\ell 2^{n_\ell\nu_\ell - n_{\ell^*}\nu_{\ell^*}}\xi_\ell^{n_\ell} \;\equiv\; a_{\ell^*} \;\equiv\; 1 \mod 2.$$

□

4. Final remarks and open questions

It seems conceivable that the nonstandard techniques used in this paper could also be applied to establish the *non*-partition regularity of wider classes of diophantine equations. We think that it would be worth persuing this direction of research.

Another possible direction of research is trying to apply our nonstandard arguments also for the study of PR of equations in finite fields. Indeed, it is still an open problem the PR of all equations $x^n + y^m = z^k$ on sufficiently large finite fields $\mathbb{F}_p$ (see [4]).

We close this paper by itemizing the most basic examples of Fermat-like equations whose PR on $\mathbb{N}$ is still unknown.

- The Pythagoras equation $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$;
- Equation $x + y^2 = z^2$ and, more generally, equations $x^n + y^m = z^m$ where $n < m$.

Let us recall that all equations of the form $x - y = z^k$ are partition regular.[2]

[2] This is a consequence of the following refined version of *Furstenberg-Sárközy Theorem*, proved by V. Bergelson, H. Furstenberg and R. McCutcheon [3]: For every polynomial $P(z) \in \mathbb{Z}[z]$ with no constant term, for every IP-set X, and for every set A of positive asymptotic density, the intersection $(A - A) \cap \{P(n) \mid n \in X\}$ is nonempty. (See also the remarks in [2] before Question 11.)

References

[1] M. Bennett, I. Chen, S.R.Dahmen, and S. Yazdan, *Generalized Fermat equations: a miscellany*, Int. J. Number Theory 11 (2015), 1–28.

[2] V. Bergelson, *Ergodic Ramsey Theory - un update*, in "Ergodic Theory of $\mathbb{Z}^d$-actions", London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series **228** (1996), pp. 1–61.

[3] V. Bergelson, H. Furstenberg and R. McCutcheon, *IP-sets and polynomial recurrence*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 16 (1996), no. 5, 963–974.

[4] P. Csikvári, K. Gyarmati and A. Sárközy, *Density and Ramsey type results on algebraic equations with restricted solution sets*, Combinatorica 32, Issue 4 (2012), 425–449.

[5] B. Barber, N. Hindman, I. Leader, and D. Strauss, *Partition regularity without the columns property*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 143 (2015), 3387–3399.

[6] M. Di Nasso, *A taste of nonstandard methods in combinatorics of numbers*, in "Geometry, Structure and Randomness in Combinatorics" (J. Matousek, J. Nešetřil, M. Pellegrini, eds.), CRM Series, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 2015.

[7] M. Di Nasso, *Hypernatural numbers as ultrafilters*, Chapter 11 in [12], 443–474.

[8] R. Goldblatt, *Lectures on the Hyperreals – An Introduction to Nonstandard Analysis*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **188**, Springer, New York, 1998.

[9] D. Gunderson, N. Hindman, and H. Lefmann, *Some partition theorems for infinite and finite matrices*, Integers 14 (2014), Article A12.

[10] N. Hindman, *Monochromatic Sums Equal to Products in* $\mathbb{N}$, Integers 11A (2011), Article 10, 1–10.

[11] N. Hindman, I. Leader and D. Strauss, *Extensions of infinite partition regular systems*, Electron. J. Combin., 22 (2015), Paper # P2.29.

[12] P.A. Loeb and M. Wolff (eds.), *Nonstandard Analysis for the Working Mathematician* 2nd edition, Springer, 2015.

[13] L. Luperi Baglini, *Partition regularity of nonlinear polynomials: a nonstandard approach*, Integers 14 (2014), Article 30.

[14] R. Rado, *Studien zur Kombinatorik*, Math. Z. 36 (1933), 242–280.

[15] M. Riggio, *Partition Regularity of Nonlinear Diophantine Equations*, Master Thesis, Università di Pisa, 2016.[3]

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa, Italy.
E-mail address: mauro.di.nasso@unipi.it

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pisa, Italy.
E-mail address: riggio@student.dm.unipi.it

[3] Downloadable at https://etd.adm.unipi.it/theses/available/etd-01182016-193806.